

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of ANGELICA DENISHIA  
DUNKLIN and CLEVELAND DUNKLIN IV,  
Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SHEILA DENISE TREADWELL,  
  
Respondent-Appellant,

and

CLEVELAND DUNKLIN,  
  
Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
March 21, 2006

No. 260872  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 83-236110

Before: Neff, P.J., and Saad and Bandstra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Termination was permitted at the initial dispositional hearing pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(4) and MCR 3.977(E)(3). It was not necessary that respondent-appellant be provided a treatment plan because the goal for the children was permanent placement.

The evidence established that respondent-appellant has a lengthy history of drug use, which has impeded her ability to provide proper care for the minor children. There was also evidence that respondent-appellant frequently left the children either alone or without proper

supervision for days at a time. Thus, there was evidence in support of the conclusion that respondent-appellant failed to provide her children with proper care and custody and that she is not likely to do so within a reasonable time considering the ages of the children. In addition, there was evidence that respondent-appellant lost her parental rights to two siblings of the minor children in 1994 and that she has not been able to end her recurrent drug use or improve her parenting skills. The evidence also showed that respondent-appellant has been observed under the influence of drugs at home. Because this exposure to drug use and respondent-appellant's lengthy absences from home are a detriment to the children's emotional welfare, there was clear and convincing evidence presented in support of the conclusion that the children would be harmed if returned to respondent-appellant.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although the minor children's attorney suggested at trial that termination was not in the children's best interests because of the strong bond between respondent-appellant and the children, the evidence presented at trial showed that respondent-appellant repeatedly left the children alone without supervision and that she was not able to provide proper care and supervision for the children when she was under the influence of drugs. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ Janet T. Neff

/s/ Henry William Saad

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra